REMARKS

By these amendments, claims 1, 12, 13, 19, 20, and 41 are amended, claims 47-48 are cancelled, and new claims 57-63 are added. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

ANTICIPATION REJECTION OVER GORDON

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 19-21, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Gordon (U.S. Patent No. 4,617,557). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1

Applicants traverse this rejection of claim 1 for several reasons.

First, claim 1 recites, among other things, "at least one container containing a drug for delivery to a patient in a drug delivery device." Gordon does not disclose or otherwise render obvious such a combination of recitations for the reasons explained in Applicants' November 20, 2008 Amendment.

Second, claim 1 recites, among other things, that "the electronic data carrier further includes a radio frequency device for transmitting the drug treatment information to the drug delivery device." While the Office Action alleges that Gordon discloses a "radio frequency device," the Office Action does not even allege that such a radio frequency device is "for transmitting the drug treatment information to the drug delivery device," as recited in claim 1. Moreover, to the extent that Gordon's blister package comprises a "drug delivery device" (Applicants dispute this as explained above), Gordon fails to disclose the transmission of drug treatment information from the asserted electronic data carrier (i.e., housing 64) to the asserted drug delivery device (i.e., the blister package) via the radio frequency device, because Gordon teaches only the one-way communication from the blister package (see Gordon, FIG. 6) to the asserted electronic data carrier (i.e., housing 64) (see Gordon, FIG. 5). Thus, Gordon fails to disclose a combination including, among other recitations, that "the electronic data carrier further includes a radio frequency device for transmitting the drug treatment information to the drug delivery device."

Although Applicants made the above argument on pages 10-11 of their November 20, 2008 Amendment, the present office action failed to address or in any way respond to Applicants' argument. MPEP § 707.07(f) ("Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it."). Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to substantively address this argument if the present rejection is repeated again.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this anticipation rejection of claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, which are patentable at least because they depend from a patentable independent claim.

New claim 58 further clarifies the above-discussed difference between Gordon and claim 1's "radio frequency device" by explicitly reciting that "the radio frequency device comprises a radio frequency transmitter configured to transmit the drug treatment information to the drug delivery device." Gordon does not disclose or otherwise render obvious such a combination of recitations for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1's radio frequency device recitation.

New claim 57 further distinguishes one or more embodiments of the present invention from Gordon by reciting, among other things, that "all of the drug in the first container is commonly stored in a single compartment of the first container; and the drug treatment information comprises information indicating that some, but not all, of the drug in the first container should be delivered by the drug delivery device." In contrast, Gordon discloses that a unit dose of a drug (e.g., "capsules" or "tablets") is stored in each single compartment (e.g., one of the compartments of Gordon's "blister package"). Gordon, col. 1, line 47. Because Gordon focuses on such unit dose capsules/tablets, Gordon does not disclose or otherwise render obvious that "the drug treatment information comprises information indicating that some, but not all, of the drug in the first container should be delivered by the drug delivery device," as recited in claim 57.

Claim 12

Amended dependent claim 12 recites, among other things, that "the electronic data carrier further comprises a radio frequency receiver configured to receive nebulizer treatment

information from the nebulizer; and the memory is configured to store the nebulizer treatment information received from the nebulizer." Because Gordon is directed solely to manually swallowed tablets/capsules, rather than drugs delivered via a nebulizer, Gordon does not disclose or otherwise render obvious such a combination of recitations. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this anticipation rejection of claim 12 for this additional reason.

Claim 19

Applicants traverse this rejection of claim 19 for several reasons.

First, claim 19 recites, among other things, "a drug delivery device." Gordon does not disclose or otherwise render obvious such a combination of recitations for the reasons explained in Applicants' November 20, 2008 Amendment.

Second, claim 19 recites, among other things, "an output configured to transmit the drug-specific treatment information via a radio frequency signal from the memory to the drug delivery device." To the extent that Gordon's blister package comprises a "drug delivery device" (Applicants dispute this as explained above), Gordon fails to disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious "an output configured to transmit the drug-specific treatment information via a radio frequency signal from the memory to the drug delivery device," as recited in claim 19. Specifically, Gordon fails to transmit drug treatment information from the asserted electronic data carrier (i.e., housing 64) to the asserted drug delivery device (i.e., the blister package) because Gordon teaches only the one-way communication from the blister package (see Gordon, FIG. 6) to the asserted electronic data carrier (i.e., housing 64) (see Gordon, FIG. 5). Thus, Gordon fails to disclose a combination including, among other recitations, "an output for transmitting the treatment information via a radio frequency signal from the memory to the drug delivery device."

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this anticipation rejection of claim 19.

New claim 60 further distinguishes one or more embodiments of the present invention from Gordon by reciting, among other things, that "the radio frequency device comprises a radio frequency transmitter configured to transmit the drug treatment information; and the drug delivery device comprises a radio frequency receiver configured to receive the drug treatment

information transmitted by the radio frequency transmitter." Gordon fails to disclose or render obvious such a combination of recitations.

Claim 54

Claim 54 recites, among other things, that "the drug delivery device comprises an electronic input configured to receive the treatment information from the output via the radio frequency signal." Although ¶ 12 of the office action asserts that claim 54 is anticipated by Gordon, the office action does not even assert, much less demonstrate that Gordon discloses that "the drug delivery device comprises an electronic input configured to receive the treatment information from the output via the radio frequency signal," as recited in claim 54. *See* 3/6/09 Office Action, ¶ 12. Indeed, because the alleged drug delivery device in Gordon is just a blister package, the blister package does not include "an electronic input configured to receive the treatment information from the output via the radio frequency signal," as recited in claim 54. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection of claim 54 for this additional reason.

Claim 20

Applicants traverse this rejection of claim 20 for several reasons.

First, claim 20 recites, among other things, "a drug delivery device." As explained above, Gordon does not disclose or suggest a "drug delivery device," because Gordon is exclusively directed toward manually swallowed tablets/capsules, rather than drugs that are delivered via a "drug delivery device," as recited in claim 20.

Second, claim 20 recites, among other things, that the drug delivery device has a "radio frequency input which is configured to receive the treatment information from the electronic data carrier over a radio frequency signal, whereby the drug delivery device is configured to deliver the drug in conformity with the treatment information." As explained above, Gordon's alleged drug delivery device (i.e., the blister package) includes no such electronic input. While Gordon's electronic data carrier may include an electronic input, such an input is part of the electronic data carrier, which is "removable from the drug delivery device," and is therefore not part of the recited "drug delivery device." The Office Action does not even allege, must less

demonstrate, that Gordon discloses such a combination of recitations. Indeed, Gordon does not disclose or render obvious such a combination of recitations.

Although Applicants made the above argument on page 13 of their November 20, 2008 Amendment, the present office action failed to address or in any way respond to Applicants' argument. MPEP § 707.07(f) ("Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it."). Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to substantively address this argument if the present rejection is repeated again.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this anticipation rejection of claim 20.

Claim 21

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to claim 21 for several reasons.

First, claim 21 recites, among other things, a "drug delivery device." As explained above, Gordon's blister packages are not a drug delivery device.

Second, claim 21 recites, among other things, "transmitting the treatment information from the electronic data carrier to the drug delivery device." To the extent that Gordon's blister package is a drug delivery device (Applicants dispute this), Gordon fails to disclose the transmission of drug treatment information from the asserted electronic data carrier (i.e., housing 64) to the asserted drug delivery device (i.e., the blister package), because Gordon teaches only the one-way communication from the blister package (see Gordon, FIG. 6) to the asserted electronic data carrier (i.e., housing 64) (see Gordon, FIG. 5). Thus, Gordon fails to disclose a combination including, among other recitations, "transmitting the treatment information from the electronic data carrier to the drug delivery device," as recited in claim 21.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this anticipation rejection of claim 21.

New claim 59 further distinguishes one or more embodiments of the present invention from Gordon by reciting, among other things, that "the drug delivery device comprises a nebulizer." As explained above and below, it would not have been obvious to replace Gordon's blister packages with a nebulizer.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OVER GORDON IN VIEW OF CHARTRAND

Claims 39-41, 44, 47, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Gordon in view of Chartrand (U.S. Patent No. 5,560,550). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 39 and 40

Applicants traverse this rejection of claims 39 and 40 for several reasons.

First, claims 39 and 40 each recite, among other things, that "each container contain[s] a drug for delivery to a patient in a drug delivery device." As explained above with respect to claim 1, Gordon does not disclose a "drug for delivery to a patient in a drug delivery device," as recited in claims 39 and 40. Chartrand does not cure this deficiency.

Second, claims 39 and 40 each recite, among other things, that "the data carrier is arranged to be powered inductively from a radio frequency signal transmitted from or associated with the drug delivery device." The office action concedes that "Gordon fails to teach wherein the data carrier is arranged to be powered inductively from a radio frequency signal," but asserts that it would be obvious to convert Gordon's direct battery power to such an inductively powered system in view of Chartrand because battery and inductive power "are [obvious] expedients of each other." 3/6/09 Office Action, ¶ 16. Applicants traverse such an assertion. Gordon powers its electronic data carrier 64 via a direct wired battery 20 within the carrier. In contrast, Chartrand uses more complicated inductive power so as to avoid having a battery in a credit-card sized electronic card 16. Chartrand, col. 6, lines 58-60. Chartrand relies on power from a large, powered base unit with a magnetic field generating antenna 18. Chartrand, col. 7, lines 4-15. Because Chartrand's reasons for using inductive power are not present in Gordon, and because the proposed modification would significantly complicate Gordon and make Gordon less reliable, without any countervailing benefit, the proposed modification would not have been obvious.

Specifically, the office action essentially proposes moving Gordon's battery 20 from the electronic data carrier 64 to the attached blister package (the alleged drug delivery device) and then transmitting the battery's power back to the electronic data carrier 64 via inductive power. However, there was no obvious reason to transfer the battery from the electronic data carrier 64

to the blister package and then transmit power back to the electronic data carrier via inductive powering. Indeed, because the electronic data carrier 64 is designed to be remote from the blister package, such a modification would defeat the purpose of the providing such remote operation because inductive powering would require the electronic data carrier and blister package to be very close to each other in order for Chartrand's magnetic flux to be sufficiently strong to power the electronic data carrier 64. *See* Chartrand, col. 7, lines 6-13. Thus, Gordon teaches away from such a modification because it would defeat Gordon's goal of enabling the electronic data carrier 64 to be remote from the blister package. MPEP 2143.01(V) ("If proposed modification would render the prior art being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification."); MPEP 2145(X)(D)(2) ("It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination.") (citation omitted); MPEP 2143.01(VI) ("If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.").

Third, claim 40 recites, among other things, that "the data carrier is arranged to generate the radio-frequency signal bearing the treatment information." The office action does not even assert that the proposed combination of Gordon and Chartrand would result in such a combination of recitations. Indeed, it would not. As explained above, Gordon involves one-way transmission of information from the alleged drug delivery device (the blister package) to the alleged data carrier 64. There was no obvious reason to reverse this transmission direction so as to transmit treatment information <u>from</u> the Gordon's data carrier 64. Thus, claim 40 is patentable over the cited prior art for this additional reason as well.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claims 39 and 40, as well as their respective dependent claims, which are patentable at least because they depend from patentable independent claims.

New claim 61 further distinguishes one or more embodiments of the present invention from the cited prior art by reciting, among other things, that "the radio frequency device comprises a radio frequency transmitter configured to transmit the drug treatment information to

the drug delivery device." In contrast, as explained above, Gordon's alleged data carrier includes no radio frequency transmitter. Chartrand does not cure this deficiency, as it is merely relied upon by the office action for inductive power.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OVER ANDERSON IN VIEW OF GORDON

Claims 1, 13, 16-19, and 51-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 5,237,987) in view of Gordon. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 13

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to claim 13 for several reasons.

First, amended claim 13 recites, among other things, "a delivery controller configured to control the amount of the drug delivered to the patient based on the received treatment information." The office action explicitly disregarded the previous delivery controller recitation because is used allegedly non-limiting functional language. *See* 3/6/09 Office Action, ¶ 8. Applicants dispute the office action's assertion, but have nonetheless chose to expedite prosecution by explicitly amending claim 13 to structurally clarify that the delivery controller is "configured to control the amount of the drug delivered to the patient based on the received treatment information." Applicants therefore submit that patentable weight must be given to this recitation.

In contrast, Anderson discloses that EPROMs are removably connected to Anderson's controller 28 to "control various aspects of the individual subsystems." Anderson, col. 12, line 58, to col. 13, line 3. Anderson does not disclose, suggest, or otherwise render it obvious that such a controller 28 is "configured to control the amount of the drug delivered to the patient based on the received treatment information," as recited in claim 13.

Second, claim 13 recites, among other things, "a radio frequency receiver configured to receive the treatment information from the electronic data carrier over a radio frequency signal." The Office Action concedes that Anderson fails to disclose such a combination of recitations, but nonetheless asserts that it would have been obvious "to use a radio frequency signal as an alternative to circuitry for transmitting information [from Anderson's EPROMS to Anderson's controller 28] because they are expedients of each other." 3/6/09 Office Action, p. 8; *see also*

5/30/08 Office Action, p. 5. Applicants respectfully traverse such an assertion. Anderson's EPROMS are physically embedded within Anderson's controller 28. *See* Anderson, col. 12, line 58, to col. 13, line 3. There was no obvious rationale to have replaced the direct-hard-wired connection between the EPROMs inside the controller 28 and the controller 28 with a radio frequency connection. Specifically, a radio frequency connection is not an obvious "expedient" of Anderson's hard-wired connection because such a change would be more complicated, and less reliable. In Anderson, the patient's life depends on proper operation of the ventilator. Due to possible inherent reliability issues with radio frequency transmission (as opposed to Anderson's direct wired connection), it would not have been obvious to transmit information on the EPROM embedded within the controller 28 to the controller 28. *See KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1731, 82 USPQ.2d 1385, 1396 (2007) (stating that it is necessary to determine whether there was an "apparent reason" to combine the known elements in the claimed manner); *see also id.* ("[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.").

Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 13, as well as its respective dependent claims, which are allowable at least because they depend from allowable independent claim 13.

Claim 16

Applicants also specifically traverse this rejection of claim 16, which recites, among other things, that "the electronic input is additionally configured to transmit treatment information to the electronic data carrier for recordal." The Office Action fails to even allege that the Examiner's proposed combination of Anderson in view of Gordon discloses such a combination of recitations. Indeed, the proposed combination does not render this combination of recitations obvious. By their very definition, Anderson's EPROM memories (i.e., "Erasable Programmable Read Only Memories") (Anderson, col. 12, line 68, to col. 12, line 1) provide for one way data communication from the memories to the controller 28. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Anderson to modify such EPROM memories and Anderson's controller 28 such that the controller 28 transmits treatment information to the EPROM memories.

Gordon does not cure this deficiency. The Office Action proposes that Gordon would have made it obvious to have incorporated a radio frequency signal into Anderson's ventilation system, but does not assert that it would have been obvious to make any other modification to Anderson's ventilation system in view of Gordon. Accordingly, by the Office Action's own account, Gordon does not render obvious any other modification to Anderson (e.g., modifying Anderson in view of Gordon such that Anderson's controller 28 transmits treatment information to Anderson's EPROM memories).

Moreover, even if the Office Action did allege that it was obvious to so modify Anderson in view of Gordon, the proposed modification would have been nonobvious. As explained above, Gordon is exclusively focused on patient compliance relating to the administration of capsules/tablets from a blister package. Such compliance and blister packages are irrelevant to Anderson's use of a nebulizer for nebulizing a liquid medicament that is administered by a medical professional. Moreover, Gordon does not disclose two-way communication between an electronic data carrier and an electronic input (e.g., an "electronic input …to receive treatment information from a removable electronic data carrier" (claim 13), wherein the "electronic input is additionally arranged to transmit treatment information to the electronic data carrier for recordal"). Thus, Anderson and Gordon, either alone or in combination, fail to render obvious the combination of recitations in claim 16. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 16 for this additional reason.

Although Applicants made the above argument regarding claim 16 on pages 16-17 of their November 20, 2008 Amendment, the present office action failed to address or in any way respond to Applicants' argument. MPEP § 707.07(f) ("Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it."). Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to substantively address this argument if the present rejection is repeated again.

Claim 56

Applicants also specifically traverse this rejection as applied to claim 56, which recites, among other things, that "the electronic input is configured to transmit treatment information via a radio frequency signal to the removable electronic data carrier." Anderson's drug delivery

device is not so configured. Gordon does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Gordon and Anderson, both individually and in combination, fail to disclose or otherwise render obvious such a combination of recitations.

Although Applicants made the above argument regarding claim 56 on page 17 of their November 20, 2008 Amendment, the present office action failed to address or in any way respond to Applicants' argument. MPEP § 707.07(f) ("Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it."). Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to substantively address this argument if the present rejection is repeated again.

Claim 17

Applicants also specifically traverse this rejection of claim 17, which recites, among other things, that "the drug delivery device includes an authorization portion which prevents delivery if any of the treatment information indicates that the drug is unsuitable for delivery." The Office Action asserts that "col. 12, lines 11-18" of Anderson disclose "an authorization portion." 3/6/09 Office Action, ¶ 20. To the contrary, the cited passage does not disclose such an authorization portion. Moreover, Anderson includes no disclosure whatsoever regarding the prevention of delivery of a drug if the drug is unsuitable for delivery. Indeed, Anderson includes only a cursory mention of the use of a "nebulizer 48 [to] add medication, such as for example a decongestant, to the gas flow 36." Anderson, col. 6, lines 40-41. Gordon does not cure this deficiency. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 17 for this additional reason.

Claim 19

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to claim 19 for several reasons.

First, claim 19 recites, among other things, "a memory located within the electronic data carrier, the memory holding drug-specific treatment information concerning the use of the drug delivery device in delivering a specified drug." The Office Action asserts that Anderson's EPROM memory satisfies this recitation. *See* 3/6/09 Office Action, ¶ 18 (relying on Anderson, claim 5, which recites "memory devices," which are EPROM memories, as explained in Anderson, col. 12, line 58, to col. 13, line 2). However, Anderson's EPROM memories include

information relating to the operation of Anderson's ventilator, but do not include "drug-specific treatment information concerning the use of the drug delivery device in delivering a specified drug," as recited in amended claim 19. Gordon does not cure this deficiency because, as explained above, Gordon's blister-package-specific teaching has no obvious bearing on Anderson's ventilation system's use of a nebulizer.

Although Applicants made the above argument regarding claim 19 on pages 17-18 of their November 20, 2008 Amendment, the present office action failed to address or in any way respond to Applicants' argument. MPEP § 707.07(f) ("Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it."). Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to substantively address this argument if the present rejection is repeated again.

Second, the proposed combination relies on replacing Anderson's hard-wired connection between the EPROMs and the controller 28 with a radio frequency connection. Such a modification was nonobvious as explained above with respect to claim 13.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 19, as well as its respective dependent claims, which are allowable at least because they depend from allowable independent claim 19.

Claim 55

Applicants also specifically traverse this rejection as applied to claim 55, which depends from claim 20. Because claim 20 was not rejected over the proposed combination of Anderson and Gordon, because claim 20 is patentable over Gordon as explained above, and because Anderson does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Gordon as applied to claim 20, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 55.

Claim 56

Applicants also specifically traverse this rejection as applied to claim 56, which recites, among other things, that "the electronic input is configured to transmit treatment information via a radio frequency signal to the removable electronic data carrier." In contrast, as explained above Anderson's drug delivery device is not configured to transmit treatment information from

the drug delivery device to the electronic data carrier (i.e., alleged by the Office Action to be the EPROMs in the controller 28). *See* 3/6/09 Office Action, ¶ 18,

Claim 1

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to claim 1 for several reasons.

First, Applicants note that the office action provides no rationale or explanation as to how the proposed combination would result in the combination of recitations in claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully traverse this rejection for at least this reason. *See* MPEP § 706 ("The goal of examination is to clearly articulate any rejection early in the prosecution process so that the applicant has the opportunity to provide evidence of patentability and otherwise reply completely at the earliest opportunity."); MPEP § 707.07(f) ("[A]n examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application."); MPEP § 707.07(d) ("An omnibus rejection of the claim 'on the references and for the reasons of record' is stereotyped and usually not informative and should therefore be avoided. This is especially true where certain claims have been rejected on one ground and other claims on another ground."); MPEP § 707.07(d) ("A plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group.").

Second, Applicants presume that the prior art would be alleged to be combined in the same manner as asserted against claims 13 and 19. If so, the proposed combination would not have been obvious for the reasons explained above with respect to claims 13 and 19.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, which are allowable at least because they depend from allowable independent claim 1.

New claim 63 further distinguishes one or more embodiments from the cited prior art by reciting, among other things, that "the drug treatment information comprises drug-specific drug treatment information concerning the use of the drug delivery device in delivering the drug." Such a combination of recitations is patentable over the cited prior art for the reasons discussed above with respect to the similar recitation in claim 19.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections have been addressed. It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent that Applicants have not separately addressed each rejection of each dependent claims, this is not to be construed as an admission of the correctness of that rejection. Rather, Applicants believe that the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for the reasons noted above, so that the rejection of one or more of the dependent claims need not be addressed at this time. Applicants reserve the right to address the rejection of any dependent claim at a later time should that become warranted.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 14-1270. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Timothy Nathan/
Timothy Nathan
Reg. No.: 44,256
Tel. No.: (724) 387-4435
Fax No.: (724) 387-5021

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
1010 Murry Ridge Lane
Murrysville, PA 15668-8525